

EXTRA VOTES For Contestants From Now Until Midnight, June 1

IF YOU want to win one of THE WASHINGTON HERALD'S seventy-seven prizes read what we have to say here. Don't stop to argue with yourself; we've been doing that for some time, and shall continue to do so until the contest closes at midnight, July 3.

THINGS should be getting interesting in The Washington Herald's great \$22,000 voting contest just now. The extra vote period is on; the Middaugh & Shannon "Flame of a Hundred Ideas" is completed and waiting for you to visit it, and the time is ripe for getting subscriptions. What more do you want to excite your interest? Your prize is yours now if you will do the work. Remember that the extra vote period will not last forever, but will close at midnight of June 1. It will positively not be extended. While this splendid vote scale is in force it may be possible for you to secure enough votes to put you so far ahead that your opponents will not be able to overtake you. If you do this you will feel so good over it that you won't want to stop, but will keep right on working just to see how far ahead you can be at the close of the contest on July 3.

The satisfaction you will feel when you have been announced a winner will give you one of the happiest moments of your life. And one of the saddest will be when you learn that you have lost through not taking advantage of this extra vote period. It will make it all the more disappointing if you alone are to blame for your losing. So you'd better get right to work before this period closes.

This extra vote period means that you can club together any number of subscriptions, ranging from one month up to five years, so that the total amounts to either \$18.00 or \$30.00, and the votes will be issued on the amount of money and not the length of the subscriptions. For instance, say that you have thirty-six one-month subscriptions. This will amount to \$18.00, and for this you will receive 30,000 votes, as per the second period vote scale. Besides this number you will be allowed 5,000 EXTRA votes, these to be given you at the close of the extra vote period on June 1, at midnight. The same conditions obtain in the matter of the \$30.00 club, save that instead of the 5,000 extra votes you will receive 12,500, which, together with the regular 67,500, will amount to 80,000. This is truly a magnificent offer, and if we have not made it sufficiently plain to you kindly communicate with

You Are Invited to Visit the
"Home of a Hundred Ideas."

The Contest Department of The Washington Herald Third Floor of The Washington Herald Building, 734 Fifteenth Street Northwest.

DAILY COURT RECORD

(Monday, May 17, 1909.)

Supreme Court of the United States

Present: The Chief Justice, Mr. Justice Harlan, Mr. Justice Brandeis, Mr. Justice White, Mr. Justice McKenna, Mr. Justice Day, Mr. Justice Holmes.

No. 100. *Isaac Lobe Straus, of Baltimore, Md.; James Hill Sherman Bartholomew, of Occidental, Cal.; Jefferson Davis Stephens, of Marietta, Fla.; J. L. Jefferson, of Norfolk, Va.; Jefferson E. Lamm, of Key West, Fla.; E. J. L'Engle, of Jacksonville, Fla.; F. H. Dorman, of New York City; Lucas F. Loving, of Washington, D. C.; George G. Goodrich, of Chicago, Ill.; Cyrus Cline, of Angola, Ind.; Alphonso C. Wood, of Angola, Ind.; Greenville Hogan, of St. Louis, Mo.; J. Kent Hawley, of Richmond, Va.; Irving Katz, of New York City; Martha Adelle Malley, of New York City; Frank Herbert Swan, of Providence, R. I.; B. A. Judd, of New York City; Ames K. McKenna, of Bangor, N. Y.; Henry A. Davis, of Altoona, Pa.; Andrew K. Hunter, of Rockford, Ill.; Charles Darwin Pennebaker, of Washington, D. C.; George S. Gray, of New York City; and William G. O'Leary, of Charleston, W. Va., were admitted to practice.*

No. 101. *The Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company et al., plaintiffs in error, vs. J. W. McDonald, administrator of Nancy J. Wilson, deceased, in error to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky; dismissed for want of jurisdiction; affirmed by Mr. Justice Day.*

No. 102. *Mellie E. Dupree and William E. Dupree, petitioners, vs. C. W. Muzzey, on writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth circuit; decree reversed, with costs, and cause remanded to the Circuit Court of the United States for the Western district of Texas for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this court. Opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes.*

No. 103. *Benjamin Usher vs. Yruegas, plaintiff in error, vs. Jacinto Lorenzo Lopez Laborde et al., in error to the District Court of the United States for Porto Rico; judgment reversed, with costs, and cause remanded to the District Court of the United States for Porto Rico, with directions to set aside the verdict and for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this court. Opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes.*

No. 104. *Jacinto Lorenzo Lopez Laborde et al., plaintiffs in error, vs. Pablo Usher and Modesta Usher, in error to the District Court of the United States for Porto Rico; judgment reversed, with costs, and cause remanded to the District Court of the United States for Porto Rico, with directions to set aside the verdict and for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this court. Opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes.*

No. 105. *City of Detroit, Michigan, appellant, vs. Des Moines City Railway Company, appeal from the Circuit Court of the United States for the Southern district of Iowa; decree reversed, with costs, and cause remanded with directions to dismiss the bill. Opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes.*

No. 106. *Elizabeth Peck, petitioner, vs. The Tribune Company, on writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh circuit; judgment reversed, with costs, and cause remanded to the Circuit Court of the United States for the Northern district of Illinois with directions to award a new trial. Opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes.*

No. 107. *The United States ex rel. Emily E. Pursh, executrix of Joseph W. Pursh, deceased, plaintiff in error, vs. Franklin MacVegh, Secretary of the United States Treasury, in error to the Appeals of the District of Columbia; judgment reversed, with costs, and cause remanded with directions to reverse the judgment of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia quashing the tax and to dismiss the proceeding. Opinion by Mr. Justice McKenna.*

No. 108. *Francis C. Welch, trustee, plaintiff in error, vs. George S. Swasey et al., as the board of appeal from the building commission of the city of Boston, in error to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts; judgment affirmed with costs. Opinion by Mr. Justice Peckham.*

No. 109. *Kalindoo Nakoko Gray, appellant, vs. David Nohola, appeal from the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii; decree affirmed with costs. Opinion by Mr. Justice Peckham.*

No. 110. *George D. Collins, plaintiff in error, vs. Thomas F. O'Neil, sheriff of the city and county of San Francisco, State of California, et al.; in error to the Supreme Court of the State of California; judgment affirmed with costs. Opinion by Mr. Justice Peckham.*

No. 111. *John Leach, plaintiff in error, vs. The State of Louisiana, in error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana; judgment affirmed with costs. Opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes.*

No. 112. *City of Detroit, Michigan, appellant, vs. Des Moines City Railway Company, appeal from the Circuit Court of the United States for the Southern district of Iowa; decree reversed, with costs, and cause remanded with directions to dismiss the bill. Opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes.*

No. 113. *Elizabeth Peck, petitioner, vs. The Tribune Company, on writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh circuit; judgment reversed, with costs, and cause remanded to the Circuit Court of the United States for the Northern district of Illinois with directions to award a new trial. Opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes.*

No. 114. *The United States ex rel. Emily E. Pursh, executrix of Joseph W. Pursh, deceased, plaintiff in error, vs. Franklin MacVegh, Secretary of the United States Treasury, in error to the Appeals of the District of Columbia; judgment reversed, with costs, and cause remanded with directions to reverse the judgment of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia quashing the tax and to dismiss the proceeding. Opinion by Mr. Justice McKenna.*

No. 115. *Francis C. Welch, trustee, plaintiff in error, vs. George S. Swasey et al., as the board of appeal from the building commission of the city of Boston, in error to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts; judgment affirmed with costs. Opinion by Mr. Justice Peckham.*

No. 116. *Kalindoo Nakoko Gray, appellant, vs. David Nohola, appeal from the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii; decree affirmed with costs. Opinion by Mr. Justice Peckham.*

No. 117. *George D. Collins, plaintiff in error, vs. Thomas F. O'Neil, sheriff of the city and county of San Francisco, State of California, et al.; in error to the Supreme Court of the State of California; judgment affirmed with costs. Opinion by Mr. Justice Peckham.*

No. 118. *John Leach, plaintiff in error, vs. The State of Louisiana, in error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana; judgment affirmed with costs. Opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes.*

No. 119. *City of Detroit, Michigan, appellant, vs. Des Moines City Railway Company, appeal from the Circuit Court of the United States for the Southern district of Iowa; decree reversed, with costs, and cause remanded with directions to dismiss the bill. Opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes.*

No. 120. *Elizabeth Peck, petitioner, vs. The Tribune Company, on writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh circuit; judgment reversed, with costs, and cause remanded to the Circuit Court of the United States for the Northern district of Illinois with directions to award a new trial. Opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes.*

No. 121. *The United States ex rel. Emily E. Pursh, executrix of Joseph W. Pursh, deceased, plaintiff in error, vs. Franklin MacVegh, Secretary of the United States Treasury, in error to the Appeals of the District of Columbia; judgment reversed, with costs, and cause remanded with directions to reverse the judgment of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia quashing the tax and to dismiss the proceeding. Opinion by Mr. Justice McKenna.*

No. 122. *Francis C. Welch, trustee, plaintiff in error, vs. George S. Swasey et al., as the board of appeal from the building commission of the city of Boston, in error to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts; judgment affirmed with costs. Opinion by Mr. Justice Peckham.*

No. 123. *Kalindoo Nakoko Gray, appellant, vs. David Nohola, appeal from the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii; decree affirmed with costs. Opinion by Mr. Justice Peckham.*

No. 124. *George D. Collins, plaintiff in error, vs. Thomas F. O'Neil, sheriff of the city and county of San Francisco, State of California, et al.; in error to the Supreme Court of the State of California; judgment affirmed with costs. Opinion by Mr. Justice Peckham.*

No. 125. *John Leach, plaintiff in error, vs. The State of Louisiana, in error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana; judgment affirmed with costs. Opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes.*

No. 126. *City of Detroit, Michigan, appellant, vs. Des Moines City Railway Company, appeal from the Circuit Court of the United States for the Southern district of Iowa; decree reversed, with costs, and cause remanded with directions to dismiss the bill. Opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes.*

No. 127. *Elizabeth Peck, petitioner, vs. The Tribune Company, on writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh circuit; judgment reversed, with costs, and cause remanded to the Circuit Court of the United States for the Northern district of Illinois with directions to award a new trial. Opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes.*

No. 128. *The United States ex rel. Emily E. Pursh, executrix of Joseph W. Pursh, deceased, plaintiff in error, vs. Franklin MacVegh, Secretary of the United States Treasury, in error to the Appeals of the District of Columbia; judgment reversed, with costs, and cause remanded with directions to reverse the judgment of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia quashing the tax and to dismiss the proceeding. Opinion by Mr. Justice McKenna.*

No. 129. *Francis C. Welch, trustee, plaintiff in error, vs. George S. Swasey et al., as the board of appeal from the building commission of the city of Boston, in error to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts; judgment affirmed with costs. Opinion by Mr. Justice Peckham.*

No. 130. *Kalindoo Nakoko Gray, appellant, vs. David Nohola, appeal from the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii; decree affirmed with costs. Opinion by Mr. Justice Peckham.*

No. 131. *George D. Collins, plaintiff in error, vs. Thomas F. O'Neil, sheriff of the city and county of San Francisco, State of California, et al.; in error to the Supreme Court of the State of California; judgment affirmed with costs. Opinion by Mr. Justice Peckham.*

No. 132. *John Leach, plaintiff in error, vs. The State of Louisiana, in error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana; judgment affirmed with costs. Opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes.*

No. 133. *City of Detroit, Michigan, appellant, vs. Des Moines City Railway Company, appeal from the Circuit Court of the United States for the Southern district of Iowa; decree reversed, with costs, and cause remanded with directions to dismiss the bill. Opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes.*

No. 134. *Elizabeth Peck, petitioner, vs. The Tribune Company, on writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh circuit; judgment reversed, with costs, and cause remanded to the Circuit Court of the United States for the Northern district of Illinois with directions to award a new trial. Opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes.*

No. 135. *The United States ex rel. Emily E. Pursh, executrix of Joseph W. Pursh, deceased, plaintiff in error, vs. Franklin MacVegh, Secretary of the United States Treasury, in error to the Appeals of the District of Columbia; judgment reversed, with costs, and cause remanded with directions to reverse the judgment of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia quashing the tax and to dismiss the proceeding. Opinion by Mr. Justice McKenna.*

No. 136. *Francis C. Welch, trustee, plaintiff in error, vs. George S. Swasey et al., as the board of appeal from the building commission of the city of Boston, in error to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts; judgment affirmed with costs. Opinion by Mr. Justice Peckham.*

No. 137. *Kalindoo Nakoko Gray, appellant, vs. David Nohola, appeal from the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii; decree affirmed with costs. Opinion by Mr. Justice Peckham.*

No. 138. *George D. Collins, plaintiff in error, vs. Thomas F. O'Neil, sheriff of the city and county of San Francisco, State of California, et al.; in error to the Supreme Court of the State of California; judgment affirmed with costs. Opinion by Mr. Justice Peckham.*

No. 139. *John Leach, plaintiff in error, vs. The State of Louisiana, in error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana; judgment affirmed with costs. Opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes.*

No. 140. *City of Detroit, Michigan, appellant, vs. Des Moines City Railway Company, appeal from the Circuit Court of the United States for the Southern district of Iowa; decree reversed, with costs, and cause remanded with directions to dismiss the bill. Opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes.*

No. 141. *Elizabeth Peck, petitioner, vs. The Tribune Company, on writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh circuit; judgment reversed, with costs, and cause remanded to the Circuit Court of the United States for the Northern district of Illinois with directions to award a new trial. Opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes.*

No. 142. *The United States ex rel. Emily E. Pursh, executrix of Joseph W. Pursh, deceased, plaintiff in error, vs. Franklin MacVegh, Secretary of the United States Treasury, in error to the Appeals of the District of Columbia; judgment reversed, with costs, and cause remanded with directions to reverse the judgment of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia quashing the tax and to dismiss the proceeding. Opinion by Mr. Justice McKenna.*

No. 143. *Francis C. Welch, trustee, plaintiff in error, vs. George S. Swasey et al., as the board of appeal from the building commission of the city of Boston, in error to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts; judgment affirmed with costs. Opinion by Mr. Justice Peckham.*

No. 144. *Kalindoo Nakoko Gray, appellant, vs. David Nohola, appeal from the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii; decree affirmed with costs. Opinion by Mr. Justice Peckham.*

No. 145. *George D. Collins, plaintiff in error, vs. Thomas F. O'Neil, sheriff of the city and county of San Francisco, State of California, et al.; in error to the Supreme Court of the State of California; judgment affirmed with costs. Opinion by Mr. Justice Peckham.*

No. 146. *John Leach, plaintiff in error, vs. The State of Louisiana, in error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana; judgment affirmed with costs. Opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes.*

No. 147. *City of Detroit, Michigan, appellant, vs. Des Moines City Railway Company, appeal from the Circuit Court of the United States for the Southern district of Iowa; decree reversed, with costs, and cause remanded with directions to dismiss the bill. Opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes.*

No. 148. *Elizabeth Peck, petitioner, vs. The Tribune Company, on writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh circuit; judgment reversed, with costs, and cause remanded to the Circuit Court of the United States for the Northern district of Illinois with directions to award a new trial. Opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes.*

No. 149. *The United States ex rel. Emily E. Pursh, executrix of Joseph W. Pursh, deceased, plaintiff in error, vs. Franklin MacVegh, Secretary of the United States Treasury, in error to the Appeals of the District of Columbia; judgment reversed, with costs, and cause remanded with directions to reverse the judgment of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia quashing the tax and to dismiss the proceeding. Opinion by Mr. Justice McKenna.*

No. 150. *Francis C. Welch, trustee, plaintiff in error, vs. George S. Swasey et al., as the board of appeal from the building commission of the city of Boston, in error to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts; judgment affirmed with costs. Opinion by Mr. Justice Peckham.*

No. 151. *Kalindoo Nakoko Gray, appellant, vs. David Nohola, appeal from the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii; decree affirmed with costs. Opinion by Mr. Justice Peckham.*

No. 152. *George D. Collins, plaintiff in error, vs. Thomas F. O'Neil, sheriff of the city and county of San Francisco, State of California, et al.; in error to the Supreme Court of the State of California; judgment affirmed with costs. Opinion by Mr. Justice Peckham.*

No. 153. *John Leach, plaintiff in error, vs. The State of Louisiana, in error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana; judgment affirmed with costs. Opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes.*

No. 154. *City of Detroit, Michigan, appellant, vs. Des Moines City Railway Company, appeal from the Circuit Court of the United States for the Southern district of Iowa; decree reversed, with costs, and cause remanded with directions to dismiss the bill. Opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes.*

No. 155. *Elizabeth Peck, petitioner, vs. The Tribune Company, on writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh circuit; judgment reversed, with costs, and cause remanded to the Circuit Court of the United States for the Northern district of Illinois with directions to award a new trial. Opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes.*

No. 156. *The United States ex rel. Emily E. Pursh, executrix of Joseph W. Pursh, deceased, plaintiff in error, vs. Franklin MacVegh, Secretary of the United States Treasury, in error to the Appeals of the District of Columbia; judgment reversed, with costs, and cause remanded with directions to reverse the judgment of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia quashing the tax and to dismiss the proceeding. Opinion by Mr. Justice McKenna.*

No. 157. *Francis C. Welch, trustee, plaintiff in error, vs. George S. Swasey et al., as the board of appeal from the building commission of the city of Boston, in error to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts; judgment affirmed with costs. Opinion by Mr. Justice Peckham.*

No. 158. *Kalindoo Nakoko Gray, appellant, vs. David Nohola, appeal from the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii; decree affirmed with costs. Opinion by Mr. Justice Peckham.*

No. 159. *George D. Collins, plaintiff in error, vs. Thomas F. O'Neil, sheriff of the city and county of San Francisco, State of California, et al.; in error to the Supreme Court of the State of California; judgment affirmed with costs. Opinion by Mr. Justice Peckham.*

No. 160. *John Leach, plaintiff in error, vs. The State of Louisiana, in error to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana; judgment affirmed with costs. Opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes.*

No. 161. *City of Detroit, Michigan, appellant, vs. Des Moines City Railway Company, appeal from the Circuit Court of the United States for the Southern district of Iowa; decree reversed, with costs, and cause remanded with directions to dismiss the bill. Opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes.*

No. 162. *Elizabeth Peck, petitioner, vs. The Tribune Company, on writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh circuit; judgment reversed, with costs, and cause remanded to the Circuit Court of the United States for the Northern district of Illinois with directions to award a new trial. Opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes.*

No. 50. *West India Steamship Company, petitioner, vs. The Clyde Commercial Steamship Limited, owner, et al.; petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second circuit denied.*

No. 51. *John C. Lynch, collector of internal revenue, petitioner, vs. The United Trust Company of San Francisco et al.; petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth circuit denied.*

No. 52. *Yadkin River Power Company, plaintiff in error, vs. The Whitener Company, in error to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina; decree affirmed with costs.*

No. 53. *Granite Blumhousen Jewell Company, appellant, vs. John Landis et al.; appeal from the Circuit Court of the United States for the Eastern district of Missouri; per curiam: The Circuit Court properly held that it had no jurisdiction for want of the jurisdictional amount, and its decree dismissing the appeal is affirmed, with costs.*

No. 54. *Pablo Yord, appellant, vs. Eugene Nolte, United States marshal, et al.; motion to advance submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the petitioner.*

No. 55. *William J. Muelly, a corporation, et al., appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 56. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 57. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 58. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 59. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 60. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 61. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 62. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 63. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 64. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 65. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 66. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 67. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 68. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 69. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 70. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 71. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 72. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 73. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 74. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 75. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 76. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 77. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 78. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 79. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 80. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 81. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 82. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 83. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 84. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 85. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 86. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 87. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 88. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 89. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 90. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 91. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 92. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 93. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 94. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 95. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 96. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 97. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 98. *The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellants, vs. The Colorado and Southern Railway Company, appellees; motion to dismiss submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Bowers for the respondents.*

No. 99. <